UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,178	08/02/2001	Craig Lewis	52646-00408USPT	7529

			EXAMINER
26231	7590	08/28/2006	NGUYEN, MINH DIEU T

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/922,178	LEWIS, CRAIG
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Minh Dieu Nguyen	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 June 2006*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-7, 9-19, 21-27, 29 and 30* is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) *8, 20 and 28* is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This action is in response to the communication dated June 15, 2006.

2.   Claims 1-30 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filed June 15, 2006 have been fully considered but they
are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Arnold does not teach generating a password
in response to an occurrence of a prescribed password generating event, the examiner
contends that the limited-use administrative password is a converted limited-use hash
(Fig. 5A, element 176) of the concatenating of the machine specific hash (Fig. 5A,
element 174) and the nonce. The nonce value is part of the password and the computer
system could automatically update the nonce (col. 8, lines 9-17) each time the computer
system is powered on (i.e. an occurrence of a prescribed password generation event).
Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine Challener with Ryu because
Challener does not teach the use of a decodable password such that a remote service
center may decrypt the encrypted packaged, the examiner disagrees, Challener is relied
on for the teaching of producing a coded password as a function of the generated
password, wherein the generated password can be determined by decoding the coded
password as addressed in the previous office action, that concept is also addressed in
col. 1, lines 25-34, for example a transmitted encrypted message is a function of the
message itself, wherein the message can be determined by decoding the coded

message using key-based cryptographic algorithm. Challener further discloses the

message is encrypted (i.e. coded) by a public key and the recipient then decrypts (i.e.

decodes) the encrypted message with the corresponding private key (col. 1, lines 58-

66), the computer system of Challener is a stand-alone system of part of a network such

as LAN or WAN (col. 3, lines 11-13), therefore Challener does not teach away from an

encrypted package that may be decrypted by a remote password provider as disclosed

in Ryu.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1, 4-5, 9-10, 12-13, 16-17, 21, 23-26 and 29 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Arnold et al. (6,601,175) in view of Challener

et al. (6,718,468) and further in view of Ryu (6,067,625).

        a)   As to claims 1, 13 and 24, Arnold discloses a method and system for

providing password protection for data processing system through the use of limited-use

machine-specific passwords comprising generating a password in response to an

occurrence of a prescribed password generation event (Fig. 5A, element 178); providing

the generated password to an operating system security module (Fig. 5A, element 172).

Arnold discloses storing the password for use in connection with a secure operating system login access (col. 7, line 56 to col. 8, line 9), however he does not disclose producing a coded password as a function of the generated password, wherein the generated password can be determined by decoding the coded password and storing the coded password.

Challener discloses a method and system for providing data security comprising producing a coded password as a function of the generated password (Fig. 2A, element 46; col. 4, lines 42-62); and storing the coded password (col. 4, lines 37-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of producing a coded password as a function of the generated password, wherein the generated password can be determined by decoding the coded password in the system of Arnold as Challener teaches so as to provide more data security.

Arnold and Challener do not explicitly disclose displaying the coded password to a user of the computer system, wherein the user can receive the generated password by providing the coded password to a remote password provider.

Ryu discloses displaying the coded password to a user of the computer system (col. 2, lines 34-37), wherein the user can receive the generated password by providing the coded password to a remote password provider (col. 2, lines 38-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of displaying the coded password to a user of the computer system, wherein the user can receive the generated password by providing the coded

password to a remote password provider in the system of Arnold and Challener as Ryu

teaches so as to obtain the needed password for accessing the information.

b)   As to claims 4, 16 and 25, please see addressed above claim 1

c)   As to claims 5, 17 and 26, Arnold as modified discloses the prescribed

password generation event includes at least one selected from the group consisting of a

computer system power up; a computer system re-boot; expiration of a prescribed time

duration from an immediately preceding password generation event; restoration of a

security level from a modified security level to a default security level, and occurrence of

a secure operating system login access (col. 8, lines 16-17).

d)   As to claim 9, Arnold as modified discloses generating the password

includes generating the password for a prescribed username (col. 3, lines 33-43).

e)   As to claims 10, 21 and 29, the examiner takes official notice that the user

accesses the system needs the username. The user is understood to mean a person

(i.e. a service person, a repair person, an administration person) therefore username

includes a service username.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to employ the use of service username in the prescribed username so as to

specifically generate and assign user account.

f)   As to claims 12 and 23, Arnold as modified discloses the computer system

includes at least one selected from the group consisting of a stand-alone computer

system and a stand-alone network of computer systems (Fig.1).

6.   Claims 2-3 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Arnold et al. (6,601,175) in view of Challener et al. (6,718,468) in view of Ryu

(6,067,625) and further in view of Thompson et al. (6,725,382).

Arnold, Challener and Ryu do not disclose overwriting a previously generated

password or previously stored coded password.

Thompson discloses a security mechanisms for thwarting theft or unauthorized

access of devices and particularly to password mechanisms comprising overwriting any

previous value of password (col. 6, lines 32-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to employ the use of overwriting previous value of password as Thompson

teaches in the system of Arnold, Challener and Ryu so as to maintain the updated

password.

7.   Claims 6, 18 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Arnold et al. (6,601,175), in view of Challener et al. (6,718,468), in view of Ryu

(6,067,625) and further in view of Henn et al. (2004/0139349).

Arnold, Challener and Ryu do not disclose the modified security level of a

password generation event.

Henn discloses a method and system for secure pervasive access comprising a

change in the security level of a certain application without changing the application

function to be accessed (page 2, paragraph [0023]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to employ the use of changing in the security level within the application as

Henn teaches in the system of Arnold and Challener so as to protect the security of the

system.

8.   Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Arnold et al. (6,601,175) in view of Challener et al. (6,718,468) in view of Ryu

(6,067,625) and further in view of Kidder et al. (2004/0031030).

Arnold, Challener and Ryu do not explicitly disclose searching a username

registry of the dedicated application upon the occurrence of the prescribed password

generation event and removing any invalid usernames from the username registry.

Kidder discloses searching a username registry of the dedicated application upon

the occurrence of the prescribed password generation event (paragraph [0307], i.e.

during login, the server searches the database for matching username) and removing

any invalid usernames from the username registry (paragraph [0324], i.e. if a rogue user

is identified, the its profile is deleted).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to employ the use of searching a username registry of the dedicated

application upon the occurrence of the prescribed password generation event and

removing any invalid usernames from the username registry in the system of Arnold,

Challener and Ryu as Kidder teaches so as to keep the registry up to date with valid

information.

9.   Claims 11, 22 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Arnold et al. (6,601,175) in view of Challener et al. (6,718,468) in view of Ryu

(6,067,625) and further in view of Warn (5,270,943).

Arnold, Challener and Ryu do not disclose the dedicated application includes a

point of sale application in a fuel dispensing environment.

Warn discloses a system for controlling fuel dispensers through a PC-based

point of sale application software (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to employ the use of point of sale application in a fuel dispensing as Warn

teaches in the system of Arnold and Challener so as to integrate pump control with

other features (Abstract).

Allowable Subject Matter

10.   Claims 8, 20 and 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base

claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior arts do not disclose upon the occurrence of the prescribed password

generation event, reviewing privileges associated with respective valid usernames in the

username registry and resetting the privileges of the respective valid usernames to

prescribed default settings.

Conclusion

11.   THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Minh Dieu Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-

3873.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mdn
8/22/06

EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER